
**DCSS P3 PROGRAM
CASE PROCESSING WORKGROUP
AUGUST 11, 2000 MEETING
MEETING SUMMARY**

I. GENERAL

On Friday, August 11, 2000, the California Department of Child Support Services (DCSS) Policies, Procedures, and Practices (P3) Program, Case Processing Workgroup held its second official session in Sacramento. The following members attended:

- ☒ Jacinta Arteaga, County Analyst (Sup. FSO, San Mateo County)
- ☒ Barbara Catlow, County Co-leader (Asst. Director, LA County)
- ☒ Louanne Declusin, DCSS Co-leader (DCSS Cty Review Analyst)
- ☒ Cynthia Denenholz, Judicial Council (Commissioner, Sonoma County)
- ☒ Linda English, DCSS Analyst (DCSS Policy Analyst)
- ☒ Laurye Gage, FTB (CAMP)
- ☒ Marta James, FTB (CCSAS Info Sys Analyst)
- ☒ Kim Mel, Small County (Sup. DDA, Santa Cruz County)
- ☒ Mary O'Hare-Teich, Large County (Prog. Specialist, Alameda County)
- ☒ Pam Pankey, FTB (CCSAS Child Sup. Specialist)
- ☐ Pat Pianko, OCSE (Region 9)
- ☒ Shirley Roberts, Scribe, SEIU (Sr. FSO, Ventura County)
- ☐ John Schambre, OCSE (Region 9)
- ☒ Jenny Skoble, Advocate (Harriett Buhai Center)
- ☒ Melanie Snider, Advocate (ACES, Legal Director)
- ☒ Pat Solomon, Medium County (Sr. FSO, Ventura County)

Attending *ex officio* were:

- ☒ Julie Hopkins, Facilitator (SRA International)

This meeting summary highlights points covered, material discussed, decisions made, and follow-up tasks for forthcoming sessions. Comments and corrections should be addressed to scribe Shirley Roberts at shirley.roberts@mail.co.ventura.ca.us.

I. REVIEW OF LAST MEETING'S MINUTES

Barbara Catlow opened the discussion with an introduction of Pam Pankey and Melanie Snider who were not in attendance at the first meeting. **Pat Solomon** acted as co-leader in Louanne Declusin's absence. Louanne was in attendance after lunch. Cynthia Denenholz asked for clarification of the July 21 meeting notes. It was agreed to make changes and send a revised copy to all members clarifying case construct. (See revised 7-21-00 case processing meeting notes.) The first portion of the morning was spent discussing case construct and making recommendations.

II. TODAY'S TENTATIVE AGENDA

Linda English opened the discussion by advising the committee that she reviewed documents and policies from OCSE and a survey conducted in all other states regarding case construct. She reported that all states except California are opening a separate case for every custodial party in the case. By doing this, the other states are meeting federal requirements. The feds mandate a case be opened every time a new custodial party is added as a payee. Counting the payees separately for reporting purposes does not meet the requirement.

Cynthia Denenholz suggested the committee provide pro and con reasons for having separate cases as opposed to one case for all payees. One reason was that many more families in California are in a state of constant flux with the children going from custodial parent to relatives to foster care.

III. DISCUSSION ISSUE *[Case Construct]*

Members asked for a clearer explanation of case construct along with reasons for the committee's recommendations. The members understand that their recommendations do not conform to the federal requirements as to construction of a case.

Also discussed were multiple putative fathers and how to handle their cases. California counties are handling the putative fathers differently in regard to adding them to the case. We will need a recommendation for handling these types of cases - should there be separate cases or keep the putative fathers on the same case? The committee members agreed with having multiple putative fathers all in one case. The federal requirements state if there are multiple putative fathers, start with the most likely. Some counties use the putative father with the most available information.

The committee members would like to recommend adding all payees, custodial parties, to the same case and have the case be noncustodial parent based. The following are reasons for not recommending separate cases be set up for each payee:

- Avoid redundant information
- One case/one court order
- Credit reporting
- State of flux of California families
- Incentives
- Will still meet federal regulations regarding counting for reporting purposes (System has the ability to count "case within a case.")
- Avoids confusion of multiple cases
- Expediency of casework
- Will have multiple accounts within one case
- Better customer service, simplicity of statements
- Easier for caseworkers and attorneys with fewer cases to track and work
- Provides a history and audit trail of where child has gone
- Multiple sub-accounts vs. multiple cases (end result will be the same)
- Saves case opening work and time (it's more work to change a payee and open a new case)

as opposed to just changing the payee on the same case)

- A child support case should stay with the child
- Better customer service with the NCP's employer
- Addresses duplicate case and closure issues
- Compliance issues (more cases could be considered more non-compliant cases for each NCP)

IV. BEGIN THE MATRIX

Mary O'Hare-Teich prepared a strawman (flow chart) that included Intake, Locate, Establishment and Enforcement categories and sub-categories. We need further discussion on the establishment category and whether only cases with new orders are in establishment. Julie Hopkins advised the committee members that a matrix is not a flow chart but a table with a summary description of each category.

As the matrix category discussion progressed the committee members reviewed the goals for best practice criteria as decided in the first orientation meetings in San Francisco. For the benefit of new members attending and for review for all other members, the goals are:

- Cost effectiveness
- Compliance
- Statistical reports
- Customer service
- Also added as a goal was:
- Uniformity

V. INTAKE

It was decided that Outreach, informing and education the public of available services before and after the application/referral is received, and the Co-locate request for services/aid will be dealt with by the Client Access committee.

1. Receive the referral or application

Discussion held on how the referral is received and what the best practice will be. The following was agreed:

- Each county will have Co-locate. Defined as: Have a person interviewing the applicant for services at the same time of application for aid. Can include orientation, physical interaction, completing the paternity packet in full, CA 2.1, if an order exists then a declaration of arrears can be completed, information on existing court orders obtained, location of noncustodial parent.
- Should serve to educate custodial parties on their rights and responsibilities.
- One-on-one interviews whenever possible.
- IV-D and IV-A services in the same office.
- Complete all appropriate forms at time of interview, one-stop-shop.
- Paternity questionnaire should be completed only if appropriate.

2. Existing Case

Existing case? If yes, combine with existing case.

If no, open a new case.

Court order exists is paternity at issue?

3. Validate information on application or referral.

- Analyze case status to know where case goes and to whom it should be assigned.

4. Proceed to next function

Depending on answers, case moves to appropriate next step, i.e., Locate, Establishment, and Enforcement.

VI. DISCUSSION *[Matrix]*

Question - coming out of intake, is the NCP's physical address located? If an order exists, are NCP's assets located?

It was also noted that a case could be in more than one process at the same time since it can take place behind the scene. It was decided Mary will expand the flow chart and add locate to each of the other areas, Intake, Establishment and Enforcement. She will delete the Locate row from the chart. Laurye Gage will be writing the narrative to go along with the flow chart and will keep track of action items.

VII. ACTION ITEMS/HOMEWORK ASSIGNMENTS FOR NEXT SESSION

Action Item	Date Recorded	Assignee	Date Due	Date Closed	Resolution
Bring questionnaires, review guide, flow charts, and statistical reports, CS157.	7/14/00	Louanne Declusin	7/21/00	07/21/00	Done
Bring compiled statistical reports by county size (small, medium and large), interstate best practices FSD letter.	7/14/00	Linda English	7/21/00	07/21/00	Done
Bring CDAA family support officer college blue binder including flow chart.	7/14/00	Jacinta Arteaga	7/21/00	07/21/00	Done
Review FTB information to share with committee with regard to case processing and systems information.	7/14/00	Marta James	7/21/00	07/21/00	Done
Bring Post-it notes in various colors, markers, all copies of handouts (20 each).	7/14/00	Kathie Lalonde	7/21/00	08/18/00	Done
Bring reports, matrices, graphics and charts specific to case processing practices.	7/14/00	Kathie Lalonde, Linda English and OCSE rep	7/21/00	08/18/00	Done

Action Item	Date Recorded	Assignee	Date Due	Date Closed	Resolution
Anyone with access to flow charts and compliance time frame charts is asked to bring them to the next meeting.	7/14/00	All committee members	7/21/00	08/18/00	Done
Case review checklist, flow chart.	7/14/00	Pat Solomon	7/21/00		Done
Discuss the issue of freeing up the state committee member's time for the P3 project.	7/14/00	Peggy Jensen/Kathie LaLonde	7/21/00	08/04/00	Request made
Obtain time frames and compliance information	7/14/00	Federal Reps	7/21/00		Done
Get 20 copies of the CFRs.	7/14/00	Kathie LaLonde	7/21/00	08/04/00	Provided members with web site so they can print sections they want
Need information on CAMP duties	7/14/00	FTB Reps	7/21/00	08/04/00	Done
Delegate responsibilities for the processing categories.	7/14/00	Group	7/21/00	08/04/00	Done
Coordinate with other groups on their actions.	7/14/00	Group	7/21/00	08/04/00	Done
Develop a strawman flow chart for 1) Intake, 2) Locate, 3) Establishment functions and fax to committee members when ready. This will enable the members to come up with the necessary details for each function before the next meeting.	7/21/00	Linda English and Mary O'hare-Teich	8/11/00	08/11/00	Done
Get information on the posters needed for the next meeting to Mary O'hare-Teich.	7/21/00	Kathie Lalonde	8/11/00	08/04/00	Posters done
Get copies of the 1999 CFR's for members (18).	7/21/00	Kathie Lalonde	8/11/00	08/04/00	Provided members with web site so they can print sections they want
Read the material handed out in the meeting and be prepared to discuss details for the functional categories and sub-categories.	7/21/00	All committee members	8/11/00		In process
Look up legal requirements for case processing	8/11/00	Jenny Skoble	8/25/00		
Analyze SB1410 material (county best practices) and document automated/manual Locate and Establishment procedures	8/11/00	Jacinta Arteaga	8/25/00		
Analyze Compendium of State Best Practices related to case processing and document best practices	8/11/00	Cynthia Denenholz	8/25/00		
Analyze Peggy Jensen's material related to case processing and document best practices	8/11/00	Jacinta Arteaga	8/25/00		

Action Item	Date Recorded	Assignee	Date Due	Date Closed	Resolution
Review other team notes for issues and provide summary to team	8/11/00	Linda English	8/25/00		
Document process for filing Summons & Complaint (and any other related proceedings)	8/11/00	Cynthia Denenholz, Kim Mel and Jacinta Arteaga	8/25/00		
Document process for Service & Notice and prior notice to NCP before serving	8/11/00	Linda English and Melanie Snider	8/25/00		
Document process for default judgements	8/11/00	Jenny Skoble and Barbara Catlow	8/25/00		
Document process for blood tests and contested judgements	8/11/00	Shirley Roberts and Pat Solomon	8/25/00		
Update Case Process Workflow documents	8/11/00	Mary O'Hare-Teich	8/25/00		
Document Workflow Narratives	8/11/00	Laurye Gage	8/25/00		

VIII. ANCILLARY (PARKING LOT) ISSUES

- Question regarding a declaration in lieu of testimony for paternity evidence.
- Some leeway may be needed due to varying court requirements in counties.
- Is a closed case (by the 3-year rule) considered an existing case when no new information is provided?

IX. CROSSOVER ISSUE

Case Construct - a clear definition among all groups is needed.

X. BEST PRACTICES

- Uniformity
- Online receipt of referral/application
- Prioritization of putative father cases opening on system and processing.